DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 821 CS 508 884

AUTHOR Byrd, Marquita L.
TITLE Public Address, Cultural Diversity, and Tolerance: Teaching Cultural Diversity in Speech Classes.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Western Social Science Association Annual Conference (37th, Oakland, CA, April 1995).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Skills; *Cultural Differences; *Curriculum Evaluation; Higher Education; *Introductory Courses; Language Attitudes; *Multicultural Education; *Public Speaking; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Cultural Sensitivity; *Tolerance

ABSTRACT

While speech instructors work to design appropriate diversity goals in the public speaking class, few have the training for such a task. A review of course objectives and assignments for the basic course may be helpful. Suggestions for instructors working to incorporate diversity in the basic course include: (1) recognize the dominance of the Eurocentric perspective in teaching communication skills; (2) become aware of the problems facing students of color and students from foreign countries; (3) work toward a communication theory that is generalizable to the entire English language community; and (4) try to utilize the various cultural experiences of the students in the class. A few specific goals for fostering sensitivity to cultural diversity center on three areas, the cognitive, affective and behavioral. Instructors must strive to reduce language imperialism--the assumption that one language or variety of a language is better than another. They must also work to render objective and fair assessments of student work regardless of their race or ethnicity. Assignments for the basic course ask students to build their speech topics around a number of areas: race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, class, and disability. Students could be asked to explore their own ethnicity and culture. The Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI), tested and found to be reliable and easy to administer, can be used as a pre- or posttest to determine the amount of change in tolerance after the course is completed. (Contains a figure with the inventory questions and 26 references.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 821

Public Address, Cultural Diversity, and Tolerance: Teaching Cultural Diversity in Speech Classes

Abstract

The author of this essay addresses four issues central to the teaching of public address in the multicultural society of the U.S. The need to create public speaking courses that are responsive to cultural diversity matters is addressed. Goals and objectives of such a course are identified. Assignments for use in a public speaking course incorporating cultural diversity content are described. And a tool for assessing the attitudinal consequences of such a course, Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI), is suggested.

Key Concepts: Cultural diversity, public speaking, tolerance for human diversity

Authors: Marquita L. Byrd,
Communication Studies Department
San Jose State University
San Jose, California 95196
(408) 924-5385

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marquita Byrd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Western Social Science Association 37th Annual Conference, Oakland California, April, 1995.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public Address, Cultural Diversity, and Tolerance
Teaching Cultural Diversity in Speech Class

Marquita L. Byrd

Abstract

The author of this essay addresses four issues central to the teaching of public address in the multicultural society of the U.S. The need to create public speaking courses that are responsive to cultural diversity matters is addressed. Goals and objectives of such a course are identified. Assignments for use in a public speaking course incorporating cultural diversity content are described. And a tool for assessing the attitudinal consequences of such a course, Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI), is suggested.

Introduction

Universities and community colleges across the country struggle with the inclusion of diversity issues in the curriculum. These issues range from diversity in the multicultural nation to diversity in the global village.

> The social and professional contexts of the 1990's will be increasingly intercultural and multiracial. Students will work in industries owned by Japanese, patronize stores owned by Koreans and Saudi Arabians, live in multiethnic neighborhoods, and take classes with students from diverse cultural backgrounds. (Powell and Collier 1990 247)

Instructors and administrators grapple with the questions of (1) whether or not institutions of higher education should take the lead in changing societal attitudes, and if so (2) what are the best methods of implementing these changes. Specifically administrators and professors are debating these questions: should the curriculum be changed at all; should the entire curriculum be reconstructed or; should changes be made in specific courses only where content about women, people of colour, the differently abled and gays & lesbians can be added on? The first question can be answered to some extent by an examination of the changing demographics of the American population.

According to figures from the 1990 U.S. Census the American population was 12% African Americans, 3% Asians, 76% Euro-Americans, and 9% Latinos ("The Numbers Game," 1993 14-15). Based on population trends the American population will be 14% African American, 6% Asian and Pacific Islanders, 69% Euro-American, and 11% Latino by 2010. In 2050 the breakdown is projected to be 16% African American, 10% Asian, 52% Euro-American, and 22% Latino ("The Numbers Game," 1993 14-15).

> By 2056, when someone born today will be 66 years old, the "average" U.S. resident, as defined by the Census statistics, will trace his or her descent to Africa, Asia, the Hispanic world, the Pacific Islands, Arabia---almost anywhere but White Europe. ("The Browning...", 1990 2)

Not only is the landscape browning it is also graying, becoming more feminine, more representative of diverse sexual orientations and more accommodating of the differently abled. These changes in the population, employment, cultural and political landscapes require fundamental changes in education. For as the cultural landscape of the U.S. changes so shall the cultural landscape of the classroom and of necessity the curriculum.

Communication departments across the nation are reshaping curriculums in order to educate students for the multicultural society in which they must live and work (Koester and Lustig 1991). A few departments have chosen to infuse the entire curriculum with issues of cultural diversity, meaning that every course in the curriculum to some extent addresses the notion of diversity in human communication. And then there is that segment of departments that has chosen to simply add one or two units to courses or one or two courses on diversity to departmental offerings.

For most speech communication departments across the country public speaking is the bread and butter course. The general education or university studies block of the majority of colleges and universities incorporates an oral communications requirement. Frequently Public Speaking and/or Interpersonal are the only opportunities that students will have to learn about communication. While a high proportion of university, college, and community college students matriculate through the public speaking course the content and assignments continue to be totally grounded in Euro-Western principles of rhetoric (Powell and Collier 1990; Nance and Foeman 1993; Koester and Lustig 1991).

Of the courses in the speech communication curriculum the public speaking course tends to be the most difficult to transform. This can be evidenced by a survey of current speech texts. A content analysis of six of the most popular speech texts led Berens and Nance to write that the issue of the impact of cultural diversity on the public presentation of ideas has not been integrated into the substance of the public speaking textbooks (1992 13). Berens and Nance attribute this lack of attention to cultural issues in the public speaking texts to the lack of direction among public speaking teachers. They suggested that "it is time for a renewed dialogue on the basic public speaking course. Significant change will only occur when classroom teachers can articulate clearly what they want in a textbook and a public speaking course"(14-15).

Instructors of courses such as interpersonal communication have been more successful in focusing course content on cultural diversity than instructors of public address. While the changes to facilitate the preparation of students for a multicultural society

in interpersonal have been more about degree than approach "there has been even less progress in incorporating content to make public speaking texts more responsive... than there has been for interpersonal texts" (1994 9). "Incorporating sensitivity to multiculturalism into a public speaking class can be an extremely challenging endeavor" (Hayward 1993 1).

It is possible that courses in the communication curriculum other than public speaking lend themselves more readily to addressing cultural diversity issues because they basically entail the instructor facilitating the learning of a fairly standardized content area to students. Frameworks from which the content is taught, specific information included and teaching/learning styles (Gotch and Brydges 1990) can be varied in order to deal with cultural diversity and it's impact on oral symbolic activity and patterns of relationships.

Primarily what students learn in most courses is the course content, knowledge generated through interactions in small-group and dyadic activities beyond the overt objectives of the exercises, and Hayward (1994) suggests that students "learn" the instructor (6). However in public speaking class the students learn all of this and more.

The speech course is more complex because each student becomes part of the course content and the public arena as they present themselves to the class (Hayward 1994). Therefore the teaching of cultural diversity issues is geared not only to the class as a collective, but the individuals who fill the multiple roles of speaker, audience member and critic both within and outside of the classroom.

The problem is that while speech instructors work to design appropriate cultural diversity goals in the public speaking class few have had the training for such a task (Cooper 1995). "As instructors, we have heard the call for fostering multiculturalism in our classrooms. We have been asked to celebrate diversity. We have been given lots of interesting activities we can use in class" (Hayward 1993 3). Unfortunately instructors of public speaking courses are only now solidifying goals dealing with cultural diversity. Furthermore, there is not enough empirical evidence to determine the efficacy of most of these activities (Cooper 1995 282) nor are there adequate methods of assessing the outcomes of such instruction.

Therefore, the purpose of this essay is provide instructors with a rationale and techniques for a public address course dealing cultural diversity. This essay addresses four issues. The first is the establishment of the need to create public speaking courses that are responsive to cultural diversity matters is addressed. The second is identification of goals and objectives of such a course. The third is the description of assignments for use in a public speaking course incorporating cultural diversity content. And the fourth is the suggestion of a tool, the Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI), for assessing the attitudinal consequences of such a course.

Review of Literature

Cultural Diversity in Communication Curriculums

General Objectives for Instructors

The student body of institutions of higher learning are becoming increasingly diverse (Koester& Lustig 1991; Powell & Collier 1990; and Gotch & Brydges 1990). So are the faculty and staff. Throughout the nation universities, colleges and community colleges are becoming more diverse. Within the multicultural university departments of communication have a responsibility to develop curriculums that respond to the diverse nature of the institutions in which they exist and the world for which they are preparing students.

Goulden suggests that the first objective of curricular dealing with cultural diversity should be to "provide an opportunity for learning that is beneficial for students" (1994 5). This broad general objective includes other more specific objectives. Courses on cultural diversity should address the needs of the student while in college and prepare the student for life after graduation (Goulden 1994 5).

The means of reaching these general objectives for the communication curriculum revolving around cultural diversity lie perhaps in these suggestions by several speech scholars.

The first suggestion is the recognition of the dominance of the Eurocentric perspective in teaching communication skills, theory, and methods (Koester & Lustig 1991; Powell & Collier 1990; Morreale, Gomez, Shockley-Zalabak; Lowe, & Pinello-Tegtmeier 1992; and Berens & Nance 1992). Without recognition of the ethnocentrism and cultural bias within the curriculum there is no hope for change.

Awareness of the problems facing students of colour and international students is a second suggestion (Koester and Lustig 1991; Powell and Collier 1990; Morreale et al 1992; Fritz & Miller 1994; Cooper 1995 279-283; and Nance & Foeman 1993). These problems are many and varied. Problems for students of colour and international students can be attributed first to oppression in the educational system stemming from policies and practices which are sexist and racist. Secondly, problems for these students can be traced to the impact that variations in cultures, governments, attitudinal systems, world views, traditions, teaching & learning styles and languages have on the process of human communication. The instructor that teaches in the multicultural communication classroom of today without awareness of and concern for these issues do a disservice to students, the field of speech communication and the educational process itself.

A third suggestion for incorporating cultural diversity issues into current communication curriculums is the development of theory that is generalizable to the entire American English language community (Koester and Lustig 1991. Currently speech communication education and research is driven by theory developed by Eurocentric scholars based on research conducted with Eurocentric speakers. These theories and paradigms, which were designed with the

Eurocentric speaker as subject, have been used out of context, in speech and language communities which are not Eurocentric.

> Even though the ideology and pedagogy of the basic course is decidedly Western, there is an assumption that all students, regardless of their cultural heritage and background, see value in public speaking education and can equally fulfill the requirements of the course...Rather than questioning the goals and assumptions of the basic course, educators place the burden on the students and expect them to overcome their cultural 'deficiencies' in order to learn effective communication behavior.(Powell and Collier 1990)

The result is that the communication behavior of people of colour and ethnic minorities is marginalized and described as deficient. The use of Eurocentric communication theory with communicants and in contexts where it is not applicable objectifies the people under study (Asante 1993; Gordan 1985). Treating the subjects under study as after thoughts by applying theory which was not generated from their communities denies their creative and generative role in the human experience (Asante 1993).

A fourth suggestion is to utilize the various cultural experiences of the students (Lervold 1994). Not only should the cultural experiences of the students be incorporated into the educational process, but also the variations in learning styles (Cooper 1995; Gotch & Brydges 1990; and Powell & Collier 1990). Use of the students' own cultural experiences can exemplify and reinforce theory. Designing course activities around various learning styles can create a more interesting course and provide students with more ways of knowing.

The four suggestions for incorporating issues of cultural diversity in the public address course are as follows. The recognition of the Eurocentric nature of communication education; understanding the problems this creates for students of colour, ethnic minorities, and international students; utilizing the cultural experiences of the students; and developing theories that are applicable across the entire American English language community. These four suggestions can provide a foundation for the development of speech curriculums infused with cultural diversity issues.

Specific Goals

The specific goals for fostering sensitivity to cultural diversity can be organized into three domains: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. While these three domains of human response are listed as separate and discrete in reality they work in concert. What one understands at the cognitive level influences how one feels, and behaves.

Awareness, knowing, understanding, questioning, thinking, logic, reasoning, and analysis & evaluation leading to critical decision-making are goals in the cognitive domain. Powell and Collier (1990) identified five specific goals for intercultural and international communication education that correspond to the cognitive domain.

> (a) recognize global and cultural interdependence in economic, political, and sociocultural processes; (b) understand an increasingly diverse world; (c) synthesize increasing amounts of complex information; (d) accurately interpret information and social action of others; and (e) make contextually appropriate choices for social action. (247)

I would add to this list the reduction of language imperialism, those attitudes stemming from the belief that one language is better than another or one variety of English is superior to another. Language imperialism produces attitude interference when listening in the cultural diverse setting.

> Eliminating attitude interference or erasing the widespread prejudice against nonstandard dialects may seem at first blush to be an overly idealistic and impossible goal. But I would argue that replacing linguistic myths with the findings of linguistic science is both feasible and vital. (Bentley 1987 77)

The reduction of language attitude interference would enable communicators to engage in more empathic listening in the interpersonal setting and more objective critical listening in the appropriate contexts.

The ability to render objective and fair assessments of the work of people outside of one's racial, gender,languge, and class groups is a goal that should be included in the cognitive domain. Judging people who are not like one's self is difficult and often results in inaccurate assessments. While they failed to elaborate on this idea in the paper itself Fritz and Miller (1994) captured the essence of the issue in the title "Don't Give It To Me--Put Me Where I Can Reach It Myself: Equipping Anglos to Recognize Hispanic Student Skills in Civic Leadership Roles...".

The literature on employment interviewing substantiates the inability of evaluators to judge people who are racially different from self(Byrd 1981). Blacks tend to rate blacks higher than whites and whites evaluated whites higher than blacks (Hamner, Kim, Baird and Bigoness 1974). Supervisors tend to give higher ratings to workers of their racial group. Evaluators tend to be able to make greater distinctions among high and low performing white employees while the evaluations scores of black employees tend to regress towards the mean. Raters tend to see the group of black applicants as average regardless of high or low performance (Hamner et al 1974). While this study is twenty years old the phenomenon that was documented supervisors giving higher ratings to workers of their own racial group is still alive and well.

Aside from prejudice and discrimination the inability to accurately evaluate people who are different from self contributes greatly to the barriers to upward mobility for women and people of colour. The Glass Ceiling Commission recently reported that 95% of the senior management jobs in the U.S. are held by white males (Holmes 1995 1). This means that the majority of people in the work force 57% are being evaluated on the job by white males who may not understand what they are seeing. Learning to evaluate objectively

the skills and potential of one who is different from self can enhance the educational experience and the workforce by allowing companies to fully utilize their human resources.

There is value in equipping humans to evaluate others in a fair and objective manner regardless of cultural differences. Experiences in culturally diverse classrooms can expediate this goal. Instructors that validate the contributions of all students and expose students to observing people accomplish goals using a variety of culturally based options could help future managers to judge objectively and fairly those who are different from his/her self.

Empowerment has been identified with cultural diversity learning (Hayward 1994). Empowerment means assuming responsibility for one's self, actions, and environment. A person who is empowered has given his/herself the authority to be in control of self and how one responds to society and the environment (Byrd 1993).

Relativistic thinking can also be associated with the cognitive domain of cultural diversity education (Brummett 1986 and Lervold 1994). Relativistic thinking is the "ability to understand that there are equally valid ways of viewing the world" (Lervold 1994 7). Applying the idea of relativistic thinking to cultural diversity education enables students to move towards an understanding of ethnorelativity (Lervold 1994).

Ethnorelativity is the understanding that disparate cultures will produce different, but equally valid world views. Once students have come to terms with the idea that their culture provides only one of many perspectives on reality then intergroup conflict can be managed more effectively. Students will cease to use the criterion of similarity to one's own culture as the yardstick for measuring other cultures when they learn to think in relativistic rather than absolutist terms (Brummett 1986).

Ethnic literacy is another goal belonging to the cognitive domain. James Banks (1981) suggests that without it a student cannot be effective in the multicultural setting. People who are ethnically literate can:

> clarify their ethnic identities and...function effectively within their own ethnic communities...develop a sensitivity to and understanding of other ethnic cultures... and function in them effectively...make effective decisions on social issues and take action to resolve social problems (9).

I would suggest a broader approach to the goal of literacy, one that encompasses more than ethno-race as a self and other identifier. Students should understand their own identities as exemplified by those demographic variables having psychological centrality in their self-concepts (Byrd 1993). Furthermore they should understand the communication, social, political, economic, and historic factors that shape the experiences of the various tributary groups that constitute the over arching U.S. society (1993). This knowledge will enable communicators to have a degree of understanding of the identities of others as they define themselves by ethno-race, gender, sexual orientation, age, ableness, socioeconomic level and or religion. The concept of

tributary group literacy is more inclusive than ethnic literacy.

Lastly, changes in the cognitive component of attitudes qualify as an appropriate goal for cultural diversity communication education. These attitudes, racism, sexism, homonegativity, religious intolerance, ageism, classism and ableism, grouped together can be labelled intolerance for human diversity. The goal of a cultural diversity communication course should be to foster tolerance for and unconditional acceptance of all human beings regardless of differences from self. Tolerance for human diversity implies the recognition of the inherent worth of another human and that person's right to exist. This issue is separate from whether or not one agrees with life style choices of other individual.

The affective domain consists of the internal states of emotions, feelings, and sentiments. They are the human responses to stimuli that involve bio-chemical & physiological changes and the subsequent cognitive interpretations, non-verbal manifestations, and verbal expressions of them.

Relational empathy is one goal that fits both the cognitive and affective domains (Broome 1991; Lervold 1994). It is defined as the creation of meaning and understanding that occurs as a product of interactions among people from disparate groups . Relational empathy occurs during that moment when people broaden their horizons to include each other. As an affective state empathy is the phenomenon of feeling with another. Communicators must learn how to create relational empathy in order to be effective in the culturally diverse setting (Broome 1991).

Behavior implies action or a physical response which can be observed. The behavioral domain centers around conduct, demeanor or deportment. Furthermore, behavior means how an individual functions, performs, or operates. Behavior entails talking, listening and doing. Behavioral goals for cultural diversity education should include rhetorical sensitivity (Supnick 1991; Brummett 1986), social action (Powell and Collier 1990); and speaking competency in a variety of cultural contexts (Powell and Collier 1990).

Ultimately the behavioral goal for a multicultural communication class is the acquisition of "skills that allow students to open the door for contact with those of other cultures" in order that unintentional friction, misunderstandings and miscommunications be diminished (Goulden 1994 5).

As stated earlier objectives and goals frequently encompass all three of the domains of human response. This last goal has to do with the classroom experience itself and requires cognitive, affective and behavioral responses from both instructors and students. It is the development of a third culture, one created by the interactions of students and instructor (Lervold 1994). This third culture should be one that fosters equity for all students, inclusiveness, mutual respect, safety, and acceptance of divergent ideas and styles (Lervold 1994; Araujo, Jensen and Kelly 1991; Fritz and Miller 1994).

With the goal of creating a third culture in the classroom

students will experience "personal validation from public recognition of the student's own culture; a classroom culture of equity and inclusion; and opportunities for contact with diverse ideas, experiences, and people" that will allow the student to expand his or her world view (Goulden 1994 5).

Rationale

While there are many articles and essays to provide guidance in terms of goals for the public speaking class that incorporates cultural diversity concerns there is minimal empirical data to correlate specific techniques to specific goals and few instruments designed to aid in assessment. Therefore the remainder of this essay is geared towards describing speech activities that serve to increase tributary group literacy and proposing the use of the Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI) as an assess tool.

Assignments

At the beginning of the semester students in a public speaking class are advised that their speeches will be built around issues of cultural diversity. Cultural diversity is defined as variations in life experiences, communication patterns, languages, customs, values, family structures, religions, traditions, ways of thinking, and world views stemming from major demographic variances in the U.S. population. The topic areas are outlined as follows.

1. Race: groups identifiable by physiological characteristics genetically transmitted from generation to generation.

2. Ethnicity: groups identifiable by cultural characteristics which are learned including living patterns, communication styles, languages, customs, values, family structures, religions, traditions, ways of thinking, and world views

3. Gender: groups of people distinguishable by biological sex and psychological gender.

4. Sexual orientation: groups of people identifiable by their dominant patterns of primary relationships including heterosexuals, bisexuals, gays, lesbians..

5. Religion: groups of people identifiable by their beliefs about phenomena beyond the five senses including the absence or presence of a Supreme Being and the doctrines, ceremonies, practices, and liturgies surrounding those beliefs.

6. Age: groups of people identifiable by a particular stage or phase of the life span such as children, teens, young adults, middle aged, and senior.

7. Class: people identifiable by their social and economic status.

8. Differently abled: people identifiable by ability levels that are different from the statistical norms of the

population. Ability is having the mental, physical, and or emotional resources to execute a task.

Students are encouraged to address a variety of matters related to the group they choose to speak about. The issues addressed cover the gamut from identity, economic status, laws, educational issues, family structures, communication styles, language usage, artistic expressions, people of accomplishment, foods, traditions, holidays, health concerns to the history of the particular group. So while the students are restricted to the master list on diversity their topics have great breadth.

There are five speaking assignments in the course the first of which, a speech of introduction, is not graded. The graded speaking assignments consists of a heritage speech, a definitive speech, an informative speech, and a policy speech. These types of assignments are common in college public speaking courses.

Unlike traditional speech courses where students chose a different topic for each course, here the students will give three speeches from one topic area. The rationale behind this approach is that students conduct initial research on a topic and through the semester build on that initial research adding more sources and information. This allows them to take an audience from understanding (definitive), to knowing (informative), to action (persuasive or policy) about a topic.

Assignment one is a Heritage speech (3-5 minutes). Each student is required to research his/her own racial/ethnic heritage. A visual aid is required for this assignment.

Assignment two is a definitive speech (3-5 minutes). Speakers define one concept or idea central to the topic area chosen. They are required to use three definitive techniques from the options of etymology, denotative, connotative, function, example, comparison/contrast, classification and professional.

Assignment three is an informative speech (5-7 minutes). Here speakers broadened the knowledge base of the audience by sharing a body of evidence relevant to the topic.

The last assignment, four, is a policy speech (5-7 minutes). Speakers use the motivating sequence to persuade the audience to support a specific policy and take responsible social action regarding that policy.

As the students move through the semester they learn not only the principles of effective speaking, but they also gain considerable knowledge about themselves. Furthermore, they increase their knowledge about the tributary groups within the U.S. and are more sensitive to issues generated by the demographics of their audiences.

Assessment

In a pilot study using over 500 subjects the Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI) was tested to determine its reliability and construct validity (Byrd 1991). In its original form the THDI, questions 9-50, was found to be reliable with a Cronbach Alpha of .86. The patterns of interaction scale, items 1-8, had a test-retest reliability of .92.(Byrd 1991). Figure 1 contains the questions on the inventory.

Insert Figure 1 here

This instrument contains two scales, one measuring patterns of interaction and the other measuring tolerance for various groups of citizens in the United States (Figure 1). Items 1-8 measured participants' interaction with various groups of people. The answer choices were yes or no. Theoretically, the scores on patterns of interaction range from 0-32.

The second scale, Tolerance, (9-50) contains 42 items designed to gauge the participant's response to people identifiable by ableness, race, religion, socioeconomic level, sexual orientation, gender, and age. The forty-two items represent highly generalized, frequently used stereotypes and folk sayings about the various groups responded to. These statements were taken from the domain of statements made by students in class discussions and by participants in professional seminars dealing with diversity issues.

The Tolerance scale had a mean = 148, SD = 18. Moderate scores fell in the range of 131-166, high above 166, low below 131. The higher the score the greater tolerance for diversity with the lower scores indicating less tolerance.

Results from a factor analysis indicated that five constructs constitute the tolerance for diversity concept (Byrd 1991). From the initial analysis tolerance for human diversity apparently is a multidimensional concept. The factor analysis of the THDI revealed five factors which have been labelled Factor 1 - Gender Variance, Factor 2 - Sexual Orientation, Factor 3 - Religious Preference, Factor 4 - Age Differences, and Factor 5 - Unity-Diversity.

Factor 1 has to do with how people respond to those who are different in gender than themselves. Factor 2 is a measure of how people respond to others of a sexual orientation different from their own. Religious preference, Factor 3, measures people's response to religious differences. Factor 4 deals with age differences and how people respond to them. Factor 5 measures whether or not a person feels that diversity is a strength or weakness for our society.

The THDI is easy to administer and requires about thirty minutes to complete. It can be used to conduct pre and post tests to determine amount of change in tolerance after the course is completed.

Conclusion

This essay addressed four major issues pertaining to teaching cultural diversity issues in the public speaking course. The need to create public speaking courses that are responsive to cultural diversity matters was addressed. Goals and objectives of such a course were identified. Assignments for use in a public speaking course incorporating cultural diversity content were described. And a tool for assessing the attitudinal consequences of such a course, Tolerance for Human Diversity Inventory (THDI), was explained and proven to be a reliable instrument.

Figure 1

TOLERANCE FOR HUMAN DIVERSITY-THDI

This questionnaire was designed to help explore attitudes towards various groups of citizens within the United States. Please read each question and mark the answer which most closely describes your feelings. It is important that you mark the questions as truthfully as possible. Giving the socially acceptable answer rather than the answer that most accurately describes how you feel causes problems in the interpretation of the scores so please answer as accurately as possible. YOUR PRIVACY AND ANONYMITY ARE PROTECTED BY THE FACT THAT NO PERSONAL INFORMATION SUCH AS YOUR NAME IS TO BE INDICATED ANYWHERE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR ANSWER SHEET. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

<u>Please mark all answers on the answer sheet provided.</u>

How often do you interact with people in the following categories?

A= Constantly B=Frequently C= Regularly D= Occasionally E= Never

1. Handicapped/disabled/differently abled.
2. Someone racially different from yourself.
3. Someone who belongs to a faith/religion/denomination different from your own.
4. Someone a generation older than yourself.
5. Someone a generation younger than yourself.
6. Someone belonging to a socioeconomic level that is different from your own.
7. Someone whose sexual orientation is different from your own.
8. Someone of the opposite gender.

A=Strongly Agree B=Agree C=Disagree D=Strongly Disagree

9. Diversity among American citizens is what makes this country strong.

10. Assuming that they have the comparable job skills handicapped people are as good of an employee as the abled.

11. I would not marry a person of a different race/ethnicity.

12. America would be a better place if men and women stuck to their assigned roles.

13. I feel anxious when I talk with members of the opposite sex.

A= Strongly Agree, B =Agree, C =, Disagree and D= Strongly disagree.

14. I would not be roommates or housemates with a person of a different race/ethnicity

15. People who are poor just don't want to work.

16. I feel comfortable in a group of people where I am in the racial minority.

17. America would be a better place if we deported all of the gay people.

18. I would not be ashamed to admit that one of my family members had a sexual orientation different from mine.

19. I feel nervous when I see or have to interact with a person who is differently abled either mentally or physically.

20. I would attend church with friends of mine who belonged to a faith/religion/denomination that was different from my own.

21. I would not object to having housing for the poor in my neighborhood.

22. There is only one true religion/faith.

23. Most jobs can be done effectively regardless of the gender of the worker.

24. Both men and women are equally trustworthy.

25. Children should be seen and not heard.

26. Public buildings should be made accessible to the handicapped.

27. In America many people are poor due to situations beyond their control.

28. American unity is not as high as it should be because of the many differences in race, language, and religion of its citizens.

29. I would not be ashamed to admit that a person in my family belonged to a different race/ethnicity.

30. People of religions/faiths/denominations different from mine often have practices that are questionable or strange.

31. I feel comfortable around people much older than me.

A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = Disagree, D =Strongly Disagree

32. People who suffer from mental retardation are of little benefit to society since they contribute very little.

33. I would not hesitate to date a person of a different race/ethnicity.

34. If a hearing impaired person can speak s/he should not use sign language in the presence of people who can hear.

35. I would be comfortable at most gatherings where a majority of the people were of a sexual orientation different from my own.

36. People of the opposite gender have too many irritating habits and manners.

37. Monetary wealth and material possessions are the most important indicators of how successful a person is.

38. I feel anxious around people much younger than me.

39. I feel comfortable attending church where the religion/ faith/denomination is different from mine.

40. Talking and interacting with people who have much more or much less money than I do does not cause me anxiety.

41. People of the opposite gender are more similar to me than different from me.

42. Old people have too many irritating habits and manners.

43. A couple with a sexual orientation different from my own would be allowed in my home.

44. America would be a better place if everyone belonged to the same religion/faith/denomination.

45. Talking to little children can be interesting.

46. Americans who remain loyal to their own subculture can be equally as loyal to the United States as a whole.

47. People should be forced to retire at a certain age because old people don't think as well as young people.

48. America would be a stronger country if there was more tolerance for differences among its citizens.

49. If I know a person has a sexual orientation different from my own I restrict my interactions with him/her.

50. Diversity among American citizens is what has weakened the fabric of this country.

TOLERANCE FOR HUMAN DIVERSITY INVENTORY
Scoring Instructions

The following questions, Patterns of Interaction 1-8 should be scored

A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1

Add 1-8 with scores ranging from 8-40

The following questions which are positive:

9, 10, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 48

should be scored as follows:

A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1

The following negative questions:

11, 12,13, 14, 15, 17,19, 22, 25, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 42, 44, 47, 49,50

should be scored as follows:

A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4

Add 9 through 50 with scores ranging from 42-168

References

Araujo, A.; Jensen K; and Kelly, V.(1991). Multicultural instruction" Strategies for training teaching assistants to incorporate diverse perspectives and communication styles into the basic communication course. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta, GA. Ed 347 586

Asante, M. (1993). Malcolm x as cultural hero & other Afrocentric essays. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, Inc.

Bentley (1987) in P.L. Boardman (Ed.). The legacy of language:A Tribute to Chariton Laird. Reno and Las Vega: University of Nevada Press.

Berens, E. and Nance, T. (1992). Is what we have, what we want?: A critical review of selected basic course textbooks. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta,GA. ED 348 704

Broome, B.(1991 July). Building shared meaning: implications of a relational approach to empathy for teaching intercultural communication, Communication Education,40, 235-249.

Brummett, B. (1986 July). Absolutist and relativist stances toward the problem of difference: A model for student growth in public speaking education, Communication Education,35(3), 269-274.

Byrd, M. (1993). The intracultural communication book. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.

Byrd, M. (1991). An exploratory research note on the concept of tolerance towards human diversity. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta,GA.

Byrd, M. (1980). The effects of vocal activity and race of applicant on job selection interview decisions, Western Journal of Black Studies,5(4), 1-8.

Cooper, P. (1995) (5th ed.). Communication for the classroom teacher. Gorsuch Scarisbrick: Scottsdale, AZ.

Courtney, J., Liebowitz, S., and Fischer, E. (1991). Communication apprehension and the Hispanic public speaking student at the university of Texas--Pan American. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta,GA. ED 348 708

Fritz, P. and Miller, E. (1994). Don't give it to me--put me where I can reach it myself: Equipping Anglos to recognize Hispanic student skills in civic leadership roles--an ethnically focused public speaking course. Paper presented at the Annual College Reading and Learning Association Conference, San Diego, CA. ED 368 022

Gordon, E. W. (1985). Social science knowledge production and minority experiences. Journal of Negro Education,54(2), 117-133.

Goulden, N. (1994). Curricular changes, communication skills, and cultural diversity: The next generation. Paper presented at Central States Communication Association Convenion, Oklahoma City,OK. Ed 369 125

Gotch, D. and Brydges, M. (1990). Effective teaching in the multicultural classroom. Paper presented at the Community College League of California, Los Angeles,CA. ED 342 457

Hamner,W., Kim, J.S., Baird, L., and Bigoness, W.J., (1974). Race and sex as determinants of ratings by potential employers in a simulated work sampling task, Jounral of Applied Psychology,59, 705-711

Hayward, P.(1993). The intersection of critical pedagogy and developmental theory for public speaking. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Miami Beach, FL. ED 372 423

Holmes, S. (1995 March 26). Programs based on sex and race are challenged, New York Times, 1.

Koester J. and Lustig, M. (1991 July). Communication curricula in the multicultural university, Communication Education, 40 (3), 250-254.

Lervold, J.D.(1994). The classroom as a third-culture:Contemporary perspectives regarding multicultural communication education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL. ED 369 112

Morreale, S., Adelina, G., Shockley-Zalabak, P. Lowe, and Pinello-Tegtmeier, L. (1992). Oral communication competency assessment: cultural diversity, ethnicity, and students at-risk. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago. ED 350 644

Nance, T. and Foeman, A. (1993). Rethinking the basic public speaking course for African American students and other students of color, Journal of Negro Education,62(4), 448-458.

Powell, R. and Collier, M.J.(1990 November/December).Public speaking instruction bias and cultural bias, American Behavioral Scientist, 34,(2), 240-250.

Supnick, R. (1991). Intercultural business communication course work designed to promote rhetorical sensitivity. Report presented at Haworth College of Business, Kalamazoo, MI. ED 388 015.

The browning of America (1990 April). Time, 2.

The numbers game (1993 Fall). Time:Special Issue, 14-15